

### REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the above-referenced patent application. Claims 1, 15, 22 and 24 are independent. Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 12-14 and 21 have been deemed allowable.

The examiner stated in the office action:

20. Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. None of the prior art of record further teaches the voluntary parameter for swapping out if another thread is ready to run, and if the thread is swapped, the swapped thread is automatically re-enabled to run at some subsequent context arbitration point. (Office Action, page 5)

Applicant amended independent claim 1 to include features similar to those recited in allowable claim 9. Applicant believes that independent claim 1 is thus allowable. Claim 9 has been cancelled.

Applicant also amended independent claims 15, 22, and 24 to include features similar to those previously recited in claim 9. Additionally, applicant amended independent claims 15, 22 and 24 to remove the feature pertaining to "evaluating a specified parameter." Further, claim 17 was amended to correct an antecedent problem regarding the parameter recited in the claim, to clarify that that parameter is received, and to include the feature that waking up a swapped out context is done in accordance with the parameter.

Thus, independent claim 15, 22 and 24 recite "receive an indication of a voluntary swap, the voluntary swap specified in the context swap instruction, and perform, in response to the received indication, a swap operation to cause an executing context process corresponding to a first thread to be swapped with a different context and associated program counter, corresponding to a different thread that is ready to execute, wherein the swapped first thread is automatically re-enabled to run at some subsequent context arbitration point," or similar language. Independent claims 15, 22 and 24 are therefore allowable for at least similar reasons as those indicated by the examiner in the office action in relation to allowable claim 9.

In addition, claims 3-8, 10-13, 18-20, 23 and 25 were amended for greater clarity, to correct various antecedent problems and/or to make the language recited therein consistent with the amended language of the claims' respective independent claims. Claim 18-20 were also amended to correct their dependency.

Claims 3-8 and 10-14 depend from allowable independent claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1. Claims 16-21 depend from allowable claim 15 and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 15. Claim 23 depends from independent claim 22 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 22. Claim 25 depends from independent claim 24 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 24.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

It is believed that all the rejections and/or objections raised by the examiner have been addressed.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.


Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 10559-303US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

*June 12, 2006*

  
Ido Rabinovitch  
Attorney for Intel Corporation  
Reg. No. L0080